



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## INTRODUCTORY FRENCH READER.

*Introductory French Reader* by WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology and Instructor in Modern Languages in Yale College, and M. P. WHITNEY. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1891. 16mo, 256 pp.

THE mere announcement of a book prepared by such an approved teacher as Professor Whitney would lead us to look for a work of unusual merit and, in the present instance, this expectation is fully realized. We have here a book not made up of scraps and little anecdotes, but of selections of some length, mostly from approved masters.

The first part contains seven selections averaging ten pages each, among them two translations from the Brothers Grimm; to these some purists will probably object, but the majority of teachers will approve of them. The objection sometimes made to such selections is that they are not French literature, but to those using this book they will be literature quite as much as the selections from Lamartine or Daudet. Like Hamlet, beginners read "words, words" and words only and the chief thing to be considered is that these words be so collocated as to make easy and interesting reading.

The second part contains nine selections, also averaging ten pages each. Here are represented such writers as George Sand, Dumas, Michelet, Thiers, Lamartine and Daudet. The only objection that can be made to these is that they are rather difficult for beginners, certainly for young beginners, and this objection will have all the more weight when we see that the notes are very scanty, hardly averaging one to a page in the second part. There are many places where pupils, even the best, will not be able to understand the text. Take, for example, the following from p. 108:

... nous donnons la caille pour boire au garçon.

Here the pupil would almost certainly translate:

"We gave the boy the quail to drink," in spite of the fact that this would be nonsense. Most pupils, especially beginners, seem to think that what is written in a foreign language

need not necessarily make sense when put into English.

Again, in making French and German textbooks it is, unfortunately, necessary to take into consideration the fact that many teachers have only the merest smattering of the language they are teaching, and the notes should be made with reference to this state of things. On this account, the historical notes in Professor Whitney's 'Reader' should be more copious. Even with the best intentions, neither teacher nor pupil will always know where to turn for information on obscure points, or may not always have at hand the necessary reference book.

The third part, finally, contains nine short poems, mostly by poets of the first rank.

In a cursory examination, the following words have been missed from the vocabulary: *caritas*, *compâfir*, *foudroyé*, *humaniser*. P. 151, l. 11, *ancien* occurs as a noun meaning 'veteran,' a sense not given in the vocabulary. So also *levant*, 164, l. 21, means 'dawning,' and *hors*, 167, l. 18, means 'except.'

The following misprints have been noted: p. 14, l. 30, *très-contents* for *très contents*, an error which frequently occurs throughout the book; 161, l. 13, *père* for *père*; 163, l. 14, *la* for *là*; 177, l. 8, *regicide* for *régicide*; 177, l. 14, *un* for *une*; 178, l. 5, *d* for *à*.

O. B. SUPER.

Dickinson College.

## AN OLD ENGLISH INSCRIPTION IN BRUSSELS.

*L'Inscription Anglo-Saxonne du Reliquaire de la Vraie Croix au Trésor de l'Église des SS. Michel et Gudule à Bruxelles.* Par H. LOGEMAN. Gand and Leipzig: H. Engelcke, 1891.

+ RODISMINNAMAGEOICRICNECYNINGBERBYFIGYNDE  
BLODEBESTEMEDPASRODEHETEBLMERWIRICANTADH  
ELWOLDHYSBEROPOCRISTETOLOFEFORELFRICESSAYLE  
HYRABEROPOR.

Such is the inscription that Dr. Logeman has found on a strip of silver belonging to the reliquary of a reputed piece of the true cross at the Cathedral of Brussels. On the back of the cross itself are the letters:

DRAHMALMEWORHTE.

And in a different place on the back:

AGNUS DEI.

The first inscription readily resolves itself into:

"Ród is mín nama; géo ic ríne cyning bæc, byfigynde, blóde bestémed. þás róde hét Æþelmær wyrican, 7 Adhelwold hys beróþo, Críste tó lofe, for Ælfrices sáule hyra beróþ-or."

And the second into:

"Drahmal iné worhte. Agnus Dei."

Similarly the translation of the Old English would be:

"Rood is my name. Whilom I bore the powerful king, trembling, suffused with blood. This cross Æthelmær had made and Athelwold his brother, to the glory of Christ for the soul of Ælfric their brother."

"Drahmal wrought me."

Logeman, from the evidence of language, inclines to fix the date of the longer inscription at about 1100. That of iconography is less authoritative, but the shorter inscription may be approximately referred to the ninth or tenth century.

How the cross with its silver plate found its way from England to the Continent is another question, into which Logeman enters at some length. Possibly, he thinks, it might be the very piece of the true cross that Pope Marinus sent King Alfred, when, at the request of the king, he freed from taxes and tribute the English school at Rome. The English Chronicle contains the record under 883 and 885 (Earle, pp. 83-4):

"And Marinus pápa sēnde þá lignum dñi Ælfrēde cyngē."

"And þý ilcan géare forþfērde se góða pápa Marinus, se gefrēode Ongelcynnes scole be Ælfrēdes béne Westseaxna cyninges, and hé sēnde him micla gifa, and þære róde dæl þe Críst on þrówude."

For the manner in which Logeman was led to the discovery, the development of his theories, and the presentation of further facts bearing on the subject, the student must be referred to the pamphlet itself, which, originally contained in Vol. xlv of the 'Mémoires couronnés et autres Mémoires' published by the Royal Academy of Belgium, is here published separately as a neat tract of 31 pages, to which are appended two excellent photographic facsimiles.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### CHICK, CHICKEN, CHICKENS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Many years ago I read in De Vere's 'Studies in English,'

"Our word kitten was originally the plural of *kit*, a diminutive made from *cat*, according to early Gothic usage, the *c* being changed to *k* to preserve its hard sound before the vowel *i*, just as we change *candle* into *kindle*. In like manner *cock* makes first *chick*, and then the plural *chicken*, which we now use as a singular by the side of the former, for 'a pretty chick,' is still a common expression, and 'the old gentleman had neither *chick* nor child,' used by Warren, shows the former meaning. It was only about the time of Wallis, as he tells us himself, that *chicken* began to lose its plural meaning; and we are told that in Sussex, to this day, the people would as soon think of saying *oxens* as *chickens*."

The reference to Dr. Wallis is perhaps sufficiently definite and the somewhat dubious "we are told" is probably owing to the popular character of Professor De Vere's book. Nevertheless later etymologists, among them Professor Skeat, regard the *-en* in *chicken* and *maiden* as diminutive endings found as early as the Gothic. The fact that we have *cicēn* in the A.-S. seems to prove that in some of the Germanic dialects the final *-en* was not a sign of the plural. But it would not be safe to infer from the fragmentary evidence of existing authorities that this is true of all. Under *chick* the 'Oxford Dictionary' says:

"A shortened form of *chicken*. Probably in its origin merely a phonetic development, the final *-n* being, in some dialects, lost, as in the inflexion of nouns and verbs, and the resulting *-e* then disappearing in the ordinary way."

One of the pamphlets of the English Dialect Society says that in some parts of Kent *chicken* is used as a plural of which the singular is *chick*. This puts the word in the same class with *oxen*, *kine*, *hosen*, and several others. The evidence here adduced can hardly be disputed; and yet the fact that Wiclif, has the plural *chykenys*, and 'Piers P.' *chickens*, seems to prove that the statement of Wallis is not true of England as a whole.

It is, of course, possible that the superfluous plural *-en-s* is unique, but the probability would be much greater if one or more analagous